

02-277

From: Sarah Quinn
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:58 PM
Subject: FCC deregulation of media ownership

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am OPPOSED to the further deregulation of the media ownership of the airways being voted on June 2, 2003 by the FCC. There have not been enough public hearings and comment on this deregulation or study on the long term implications and effects of this proposed change.

I urge you to oppose this deregulation until there has been time for more public hearings and study of the long term implications of these changes.

In my view there is already too much concentration of media in the hands of a few companies. I believe this limits the scope of information and neutrality of news coverage. To allow it to be further concentrated in the hands and bias of a few companies is not in the interest of the public good. And after all THE AIRWAYS BELONG TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE not a few companies. Further I believe the deregulation will concentrate news coverage and information to the lowest common denominator and will further erode local coverage. There needs to be thoughtful, serious oversight of media in order to insure the interest of the public are being protected.

Sincerely,

Sarah Emma Quinn
715 30th Ave. S.
Seattle, WA 98144

From: Teddy Martinez
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:00 PM
Subject: FCC Ruling

Mr. Powell,

I have recently heard that the FCC is considering a ruling this June regarding the consolidation of radio and TV stations by large corporations. I feel that this decision is being made prematurely without the full knowledge of the public. I ask that you please consider putting off this ruling until it has been thoroughly debated and investigated. There should be some consensus and disclosure regarding this issue. Thank you for your time,

Teddy M. Martinez
-Avid Radio Listener

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

From: Stan Friedland
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:01 PM
Subject: Media ownership

You have scheduled a vote next month on the extremely important issue of permitting even greater ownership of media by one entity. Yet, this issue has barely been publicized to the general public, and certainly not discussed with any degree of depth or width, considering its huge significance. Consequently, one is led to believe that this rush to vote, while the issue has been kept under raps, is being intentionally done to fool or shortchange the American people, in order to deliver more of OUR airwaves into the hands of fewer & fewer monopolistic owners. Such an action would range from irresponsible to perhaps criminal! Surely, you all took an oath of office when you became a commissioner! That oath makes the public your number ONE clientele, and not vested interests! If you're serving their interests first, then not only are you violating your oath, you are betraying public trust in a very harmful way. Our democracy is based on pluralistic avenues for free expression. Clearly, an affirmative vote on this poorly conceived issue, will run totally counter to this important premise of our democracy.

I request most urgently of each Commissioner a reconsideration of this vote. I ask that it not be held, and if it is, that you vote NO on it! To do otherwise would be to clearly harm the public good and to make a terrible dent in one of our most basic democratic premises, the need for widespread forums of free speech!

Sincerely,
Stan Friedland
Syosset, N.Y.

From: Sara Baldwin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:01 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC changes

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the changes the FCCs is considering that would deregulate media ownership-limits in local markets.. This change would result in fewer media companies and thus a higher concentration of media control in the hands of a few large corporations.

I teach English as a Second Language at a community college in Seattle. One of my subjects is Citizenship. I teach new immigrants and refugee adults about our country and its democratic form of government. We study the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I tell my students that our democracy is based on a free press, and that a FREE press represents a wide variety of viewpoints. This includes a widely diverse LOCAL perspective. This Diversity of local perspectives would be lost if the critical safeguards that are designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership are ended under the FCC plans. Under these plans, there would be fewer owners of networks, TV and radio stations, and newspapers which would lessen the variety of viewpoints in our media.

I attended the FCC hearing at the University of Washington on March 7, 2003 and listened to the many people testifying about these proposed changes. It was clear from the audience reactions that most of them were very much against these proposals. However, it doesnt appear as if the audiences opinions are being taken into consideration even though most of them signed postcards and petitions opposing these changes. Why are opinions being solicited at such hearings if they are not being considered?

At this hearing, I learned many facts that support my opposition to these proposed changes, including the fact that after the last deregulation, Los Angeles ended up with NO locally owned TV stations or newspapers. Surely this is not helping the citizens of Los Angeles make informed decisions about their city, environment or the laws that govern them.

It is clear that we need MORE locally owned TV & radio stations and newspapers to protect and ensure our democracy in the United States. Thank you for considering my opinions in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Sara Baldwin
6317 Linden Ave. N
Seattle, WA 98103

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: val scott
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:01 PM
Subject: ownership of the media and public airways

Dear Commissioner,

It is clearly vital to our democracy and American way of life that our citizens have daily access to a variety of views and diverse opinions. You are the stewards of this democratic right and your upcoming vote on the rules of media ownership is crucial. In view of this, your apparent rush to hold the vote without fully informing the public and gaining their input is unconscionable.

I hereby demand that you postpone the vote on media ownership rules until full public hearings can be held across the country and in the Congress.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Valorie Scott, Westfield, Massachusetts

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Stan Friedland
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:02 PM
Subject: Fw: Media ownership

----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Friedland
To: mpowell@fcc.gov
Sent: Saturday, May 03, 2003 1:02 PM
Subject: Media ownership

You have scheduled a vote next month on the extremely important issue of permitting even greater ownership of media by one entity. Yet, this issue has barely been publicized to the general public, and certainly not discussed with any degree of depth or width, considering its huge significance. Consequently, one is led to believe that this rush to vote, while the issue has been kept under raps, is being intentionally done to fool or shortchange the American people, in order to deliver more of OUR airwaves into the hands of fewer & fewer monopolistic owners. Such an action would range from irresponsible to perhaps criminal! Surely, you all took an oath of office when you became a commissioner! That oath makes the public your number ONE clientele, and not vested interests! If you're serving their interests first, then not only are you violating your oath, you are betraying public trust in a very harmful way. Our democracy is based on pluralistic avenues for free expression. Clearly, an affirmative vote on this poorly conceived issue, will run totally counter to this important premise of our democracy.

I request most urgently of each Commissioner a reconsideration of this vote. I ask that it not be held, and if it is, that you vote NO on it! To do otherwise would be to clearly harm the public good and to make a terrible dent in one of our most basic democratic premises, the need for widespread forums of free speech!

Sincerely,
Stan Friedland
Syosset, N.Y.

From: Wh6334@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:15 PM
Subject: No to monopolies of the news media

To whom it may concern at the FCC.

Don't change the rules and allow a monopoly to own the news media. We need diversification in the media so as to get diverse opinions with which to form intelligent choices in our everyday lives.

WE, the public own the airwaves and the radio and TV stations should be required to donate free time to those people running for government office. Say for a period of two weeks prior to election. This would reduce the need for political figures to beg for campaign contributions and might make the system less corrupt.

Sincerely,
William J. Hansen
PO Box 1062
Mayer, AZ 86333

From: Membership.Department
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:16 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Review

Dear Chairman Powell,

I strongly urge you to delay the June 2nd decision on Media De-regulation. Allowing a few large corporations to concentrate their ownership of media outlets in this country will seriously erode the quality of news the public now receives. Ultimately, the quality of life in this country will suffer from the ignorance of an ill-informed public.

The fact that these proposed changes have been little reported is in itself upsetting, and your determination to rush these changes through without public debate is unsupportable. Your role is to protect the public interest, not that of major corporations.

Sincerely,

Mary Taylor
New York, NY

CC: Michael Copps

From: Alice A. Webb
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:17 PM
Subject: FCC Regulations of Ownership

Chairman Powell:

I want to request that the pending FCC elimination of ownership regulations for the news media and internet be denied. These are the reasons we need a variety of owners of all media rather than a consolidation of ownership:

1 The electronic airways and internet are a property of all the public, so no one has the right to stake a claim on any part of the broad band unless authorized by a federal agency.

2. The "public" is made up of all types of people with a multitude of differences. This is good because it gives us the strength of our democracy and the creativity of our industry. We are all different so we want and need a variety of information and interests.

3. Concentration of ownership will lead to a dumbing down and a standardization of information and entertainment available to the public. This eliminates some of the resources for our diversity.

4. Our country will strengthen competition if we allow new ideas to have access to the public forum. Mega-conglomerates controlling access to information and entertainment don't like competition. We will all become poorer except for the few conglomerates controlling the industry.

5. Concentration of information will make it easier for industry and government to hide and distort facts and opinions. Our recent Wall Street and industry scandals are an example.

For these and more reasons I strongly urge that the FCC seek a broad scope of ideas before we encourage a concentration of the media industry. We all want more, not less choices of ideas and information.

Alice A. Webb
16761 Mission Way
Sonoma, CA, 95476

From: Barb S. Pakula
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:19 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Barb S. Pakula (blydialydia@hotmail.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to you today regarding the June 2, 2003 vote that will further deregulate our media air ways and eliminate the current ban on cross ownership. I do not profess to be all that intelligent on knowing what is best for my fellow citizens, but from what I can grasp of this situation is, it isn't something that should be done. Our country is already shrinking in terms of ownership and power. This de regulation will hasten that in a very important area , our media. This will have a profound effect as it is allowed to grow over time.

I have heard the Chairman Powell thinks it would be good and efficient to put our media in to fewer bigger more powerful hands. Many of us simple Americans out here don't see that, and we Mr. Adelstein don't seem to have any real representation anymore.

So, I am asking you to represent me and please vote NO on June 2. No to more media deregulation, No to more power to fewer. This just doesn't sound American to me at all Mr Adelstein, does it too you?

Thank you sir, for your time,

Barb S. Pakula

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1

Remote host: 68.72.38.52

Remote IP address: 68.72.38.52

From: john.fuller
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:26 PM
Subject: Deregulation of the communications industry

Dear Mr Powell:

I've read and heard of your apparent head-long rush to remove all restrictions upon ownership and operation of media companies from newspapers to ISPs and radio and TV stations. I am in complete agreement with Commissioner Copps on the need for widespread, deliberate public hearings on this issue. I am adamantly opposed to the wholesale removal of restrictions on ownership of various media outlets.

It really doesn't matter what you believe is appropriate, sir. What matters is that the airwaves belong to the American people. They very much deserve to understand the issues and to comment on the decision process prior to the FCC taking a vote. Voting in June without the benefit of full and open public hearings on this issue is absolutely at odds with the rights of the American public.

Sir, it is your responsibility to hear the people speak prior to forcing a decision as far reaching as this will be. Why do you insist on rushing this process and making the decision without the benefit of public hearings all over the country?

Television is a wasteland. Most pop-format radio stations play garbage. It is only in the refuge of Public Radio and Television that we can find intelligent, informative programming. Your apparent desire to allow unfettered consolidation within the media is unquestionably NOT in the public interest. Please take the time to fully air the issues with the country and to allow for Congressional hearings prior to forcing this far-reaching decision.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

John Fuller, Major, USAF Ret.
Nashville, TN

CC: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy

From: Leni Margolis
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:30 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Leni Margolis (Elmarg5@aol.com) writes:

Please do not change the rules on media ownership. Removing current restrictions would facilitate consolidation of major media ownership thereby narrowing the reporting, perspectives and opinions on the events that affect our daily lives. Concentrating the power of media in the hands of a few is as great a threat to our democracy as a band of terrorists with guns.

Furthermore, taking action on this vital issue when so many of us have been distracted by events in the Middle East and without the media attention this issue deserves appears suspicious, surreptitious and disdainful of the American public's right to know.

Please, I urge you to at least postpone the vote until there has been a real public debate.

Thank you.

Leni Margolis
1035 SE 14th Ave. #5
Portland, OR 97214

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.81.26.139
Remote IP address: 198.81.26.139

From: DMCLV@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:32 PM
Subject: stop the media juggernaut

Dear Commission members:

The media/press in this country is based on principles that were written with forethought and wisdom way back in the 1930's. It's principles and values still endure today and do not need to be changed or augmented. The airwaves in America belong to the citizens of the United States and must serve the public interest. Keep it that way. The consolidation of corporate power does not serve the public interest, as *alternative voices and differing points of view* are squelched to appease the corporate pocket book. We must protect the free speech and individual opinions of the "little guy" and keep the "bottom line" mentality out of the press, Internet, and media. Separation of ownership and power insure that many voices are heard, instead of one massive "party line." As the media giant Barry Diller puts it:

"Today as the FCC is pondering, and pondering what to do - the great big beautiful tomorrow has dawned. The 500 plus channels that were going to turn the old, heavily regulated world upside down -- is a full blown reality.

And before we go with the urge and throw everything out, what has the wisdom of the current rules gotten us. Well, what it got us was a rather clearly unintended consequence - The unintended consequence of deregulation is that the government has inadvertently allowed to happen the exact opposite of what it intended to do.

The big bad truth that I don't think anyone really understands or gives enough importance to is that the big four networks have in fact reconstituted themselves into the oligopoly that the FCC originally set out to curb back in the 1960s.

Five corporations, with their broadcast and cable networks, are now on the verge of controlling the same number of households as the big three did 40 years ago. We didn't think that was such a healthy situation back then, but back then there was this real, scary regulation - they may have controlled 90% of what people saw, *but they operated with a sense of public responsibility* that simply doesn't exist for these vertically integrated giant media conglomerates, driven only to fit the next piece in their puzzle for world media dominance.

All right. So there's concentration? Why should we care?

We should care for the same three reasons that the FCC cares. If I may quote the current chairman: "The public interest is about promoting diversity, localism, and competition."

Are we going to get real diversity? The program departments of these businesses are now so far down the chain of life in these giant enterprises that it's a miracle that all shows on the air aren't about rejection. Conglomerates buy eyeballs. That's it...and they leverage - oh do they do that - they leverage their producing power to drive content - their distribution power - such as retransmission consent - to drive new services - and their promotional power to literally obliterate competitors.

The old systems of course had flaws - but there was a tight yoke between what went on the air and the ultimate boss - and it was good that that chain was yanked both ways, often to the public's great good fortune.

No one knows what's the best system for creativity, but for sure it doesn't work great without the pride and passion of the boss on the line and engaged. Ten years ago, independents produced sixteen new series. Last year they produced just one.

It's difficult to sustain an industry on one show, and, in fact the independents are dying in droves. Many of the small and medium sized ones are either out of business or work for the larger organizations, so they are, by definition, no longer independent.

The second criterion is localism. How does that look? The canary in the coal mine here is radio. Oligopolies now control a majority of radio markets. Under the old rules the top two station owners had 115 stations between them, now they've got 1,400. In many major markets they control 80 percent of the listenership with programming that originates hundreds of miles away - a disk jockey in Cincinnati broadcasting to Atlanta ain't very local. "

He should know.

Sincerely,
David M. Chambers
7420 Oak Grove Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89117

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, GBOYRACER@aol.com, Kmkvegas@aol.com, LVINFERN@aol.com, Ravenglassart@aol.com, Seer@aol.com, melpohl@mac.com, Glsm1@aol.com, BONKLEY@aol.com

From: Mario Hieb
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:35 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Jon,

I read your remarks regarding the Northern California Hearing on FCC Media Ownership Rules and agree with your position.

I've been in broadcasting for over 25 years and the Telecom Act (spearheaded by South Dakota's own Benedict Arnold, Larry Pressler) is the worst thing that has happened to the industry.

Here in Salt Lake City, Bonneville International, the media arm of the Mormon Church, is about to acquire several radio stations from Simmons Media. The Mormon Church already owns 2 TV stations (KSL and KBYU), 2 radio stations (KSL and KBYU-FM) and a newspaper (Deseret News) in the market. They already have a political (Republican) stranglehold on the state. The joke among Utah liberals is that now that Bush has freed Iraq, he should invade Utah and restore democracy.

The irony here is that, in Washington, we have the FTC to protect the public from monopolies and the FCC to create them.

Keep up the good work.

Mario

From: NanWalt
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:35 PM
Subject: vote

Dear Chairman Powell:

Please vote against further consolidation of the media. I am distressed to think that our freedom of the press is eroding so rapidly. I'm old enough to remember how good it was to have locally owned newspapers, radio and TV stations, and to have so many opinions and ideas expressed. This is what enhances our diversity and makes us free, unlike many other countries with controlled media. Thank you very much. Sincerely yours, Nancy Dennett

From: judith boyd
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:35 PM
Subject: Media conglomerates

Dear Chairman Powell:

I urge you in the strongest possible terms to stop the growth in media conglomerates. For our democracy to remain healthy, we need as many viewpoints as possible...local, national and worldwide. We've already seen how local broadcasts die when these huge conglomerates take over.

We know that the airwaves belong to the people. As such, we deserve the widest choice of viewpoints possible.

Thank you.

Yours truly,
Judith Boyd

From: NanWalt
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:52 PM
Subject: vote

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

Please vote against further consolidation of our media. I remember how wonderful it was when we had many locally owned newspapers, radio and TV stations, and ideas and opinions were more freely discussed. What makes our nation strong and stand out against those countries with controlled media is real freedom of the press not the token freedom we are fast approaching. Sincerely yours, Nancy Dennett

From: bcapas
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:11 PM
Subject: Media is fourth arm of Government

(1) President, (2) Senate, (3) House, and the (4) Independent Media.

The media has historically been the watchdog of our government and society. An independent media is crucial to government. All you have to do is look at the Middle East stations where few people or government runs the media.

We are still a free country and one of the main reasons is getting a story competitively.

From: bcapas
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:11 PM
Subject: Media is fourth arm of Government

(1) President, (2) Senate, (3) House, and the (4) Independent Media.

The media has historically been the watchdog of our government and society. An independent media is crucial to government. All you have to do is look at the Middle East stations where few people or government runs the media.

We are still a free country and one of the main reasons is getting a story competitively.

From: Brice Bernard
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:12 PM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

I beg of you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that are now in effect which give the american public the opportunity to read/or hear the various viewpoints on imptant matters.

Our country recently has been , and is now, in the process of making the Iraq people free. Please do not limit the american people only to the viewpoints of the media conglomerates.

Thank you.

Brice J.

From: Nancy E Parke
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:23 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Nancy E Parke (earthmom50@cox.net) writes:

Diversity of ownership and perspective is imperative for a democracy. Any move toward consolidation is a move toward corporatism. Support democracy. Thank You, Nancy Parke

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.97.208.12
Remote IP address: 68.97.208.12

From: Fgubanc@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:30 PM
Subject: Vote on June 2nd

It is urgently important that the American public be informed of the decisions that will be made on June 2nd. The relaxing of the present regulations could create monopolies of media and create vacuums in the information that every citizen is entitled to. I oppose any relaxing of the present rules. I feel that we already have too many monopolies of media. Clear Channel Communications is a perfect example of this.

I am very disappointed that your Commission has not made the information more available to every individual in American as it will affect every person for years to come.

Any vote should be postponed until open and public hearings have been held in every major city.

Florence Gubanc
Oakton, VA

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Bruce and Dilma Stamm
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:44 PM
Subject: Removal of restrictions on station ownership

Dear Sir:

I hope you will give further consideration to the change in regulation that, among other things, would allow a single entity to own more than thirty-five percent of all the stations in the country.

My wife is Honduran. She listened to a Spanish language radio station from Indianapolis for a long time. It was very community oriented, complete with call in shows, news, information about local events of interest to Hispanics.

This station has been sold. Now it's only packaged music and the guy who introduces the commercials.

Give these new regulations a bit more thought, Please.

Bruce Stamm